

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on December 8, 2006.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 18, 22, 23, 26, 27, 31, 34, 39, and 40 are amended. Claims 41-50 are added. As a result, claims 1-50 are now pending in this application.

Objection to the Drawings

Applicant submits that the drawings show every feature specified in the claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 13-30 and 34-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as lacking adequate description or enablement.

Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant submits that the specification satisfies 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant selectively amends 13-30 and 34-40. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 13-30 and 34-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.

Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant submits that claims 13-30 and 34-40 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant selectively amends claims 13-30 and 34-40. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 13, 16, 17, 18, 21, 34 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Mizoguchi et al. (U.S. 5,801,521, hereinafter referred to as Mizoguchi).

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the reasons presented below.

Applicant believes that claim 13 is not anticipated by Mizoguchi because Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi everything recited in claim 13. For example, Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi "the second non-magnetic insulating layer is between the first conductive pattern and

the second conductive pattern". Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 13. Dependent claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 13 and recite the things of claim 13. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 16 and 17 are also not anticipated by Mizoguchi for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 13, plus the additional things recited in claims 16 and 17. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 16 and 17.

Applicant believes that claim 18 is not anticipated by Mizoguchi because Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi everything recited in claim 18. For example, Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi "the second non-magnetic insulating layer is between the first conductive pattern and the second conductive pattern" and "the second magnetic layer is between the first conductive pattern and the second conductive pattern". Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 18. Dependent claim 21 depends from claim 18 and recites the things of claim 18. Thus, Applicant believes that claim 21 is also not anticipated by Mizoguchi for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 18, plus the additional things recited in claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 21.

Applicant believes that claim 34 is not anticipated by Mizoguchi because Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi everything recited in claim 34. For example, Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi "the second non-magnetic insulating layer is between the first conductive pattern and the second conductive pattern". Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 34.

Applicant believes that claim 39 is not anticipated by Mizoguchi because Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi everything recited in claim 39. For example, Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi "the second non-magnetic insulating layer is between the first conductive pattern and the second conductive pattern". Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 39.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 14, 15, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi.

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the reasons presented below.

Claims 14, 15, 19, and 20 depend from their claims 13 and 18. Thus, Applicant also believes that claims 14, 15, 19, and 20 are patentable over Mizoguchi for at least the reasons presented above regarding claims 13 and 18, plus the things recited in claims 14, 15, 19, and 20. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 14, 15, 19, and 20.

Further, Applicant objects to the Office Notice based on the following reasons.

Objection to Official Notice

The Office Action cites a single document (Mizoguchi) to reject claims 14, 15, 19, and 20 of the present application under 35 USC § 103(a) based on the reason that some of the specific features in these claims, although not taught by the single document, are "obvious matters of design choice". The Office Action offers no documents to support the rejection of the specific features in claims 14, 15, 19, and 20. Thus, Applicant assumes that the Examiner is taking Official Notice in rejecting claims 14, 15, 19, and 20 based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited document. Applicant respectfully traverses the taking of Official Notice and, pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2144.03, Applicant requests documents or an affidavit to support the rejection. Moreover, Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi a motivation to modify the teaching of Mizoguchi as proposed in the Office Action. In the absence of documents or an affidavit to support the rejection of claims 14, 15, 19, and 20, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 14, 15, 19, and 20.

Claims 22-30 and 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizoguchi in view of Walsh (U.S. 6,233,834, herein after referred to as Walsh).

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the reasons presented below.

Applicant believes that claim 22 is patentable over Mizoguchi and Walsh because Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi and Walsh everything recited in claim 22. For example, Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi and Walsh "the second non-magnetic insulating layer is between the first conductive pattern and the second conductive pattern". Accordingly, Applicant

requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 22. Dependent claims 35 and 36 depend from claim 22 and recite the things of claim 22. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 35 and 36 are also patentable over Mizoguchi and Walsh for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 22, plus the additional things recited in claims 35 and 36. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 35 and 36.

Applicant believes that claim 23 is patentable over Mizoguchi and Walsh because Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi and Walsh everything recited in claim 23. For example, Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi and Walsh "the second non-magnetic insulating layer is between the first conductive pattern and the second conductive pattern". Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 23. Dependent claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 23 and recite the things of claim 23. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 24 and 25 are also patentable over Mizoguchi and Walsh for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 23, plus the additional things recited in claims 24 and 25. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 24 and 25.

Applicant believes that claim 26 is patentable over Mizoguchi and Walsh because Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi and Walsh everything recited in claim 26. For example, Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi and Walsh "the second non-magnetic insulating layer is between the first conductive pattern and the second conductive pattern". Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 26. Dependent claims 37 and 38 depend from claim 26 and recite the things of claim 26. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 37 and 38 are also patentable over Mizoguchi and Walsh for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 26, plus the additional things recited in claims 37 and 38. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 37 and 38.

Applicant believes that claim 27 is patentable over Mizoguchi and Walsh because Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi and Walsh everything recited in claim 27. For example, Applicant cannot find in Mizoguchi and Walsh "the second non-magnetic insulating layer is between the first conductive pattern and the second conductive pattern". Accordingly, Applicant

requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 27. Dependent claims 28-30 depend from claim 27 and recite the things of claim 27. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 28-30 are also patentable over Mizoguchi and Walsh for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 27, plus the additional things recited in claims 28-30. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 28-30.

New Claims

Applicant believes that new claims 41-50 are patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant requests consideration and allowance of new claims 41-50.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6969 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

KIE Y. AHN ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6969

Date 4-9-2007

By Viet V. Tong

Viet V. Tong
Reg. No. 45,416

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 9 day of April 2007.

Kate Gardner
Name

Kate Gardner
Signature